

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER.

UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

LXXXVII. VOL. IV.—No. 8.]

LONDON: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19TH, 1843.

[PRICE 4d.]

"CHEAP SUGAR BY FREE LABOUR."

AN elaborate paper on the above important subject has appeared in a supplement to the *Spectator* of the present week. The information it contains has been collected with great diligence, and arranged with consummate skill, and will, no doubt, create a powerful sensation throughout the country. To render it as captivating as possible, it not only proposes to answer the question, "How can sugar be made and kept cheap?" but to solve what is termed the more complex problem:—"How is sugar to be made cheap by free labour?" The paper is addressed "in particular to three classes—the Free-traders, the West India Interest, and the Friends of the Negro race." Belonging to the latter class, and certainly not opposed to either of the former, we accept the invitation of our able contemporary to consider his facts, arguments, and conclusions, with that attention which they demand.

The importance of sugar, considered as an article of commerce and revenue is strikingly exhibited in the following paragraph:—

"In 1840, there were imported into the United Kingdom 4,035,845 cwt. of sugar; 229,511 cwt. of raw sugar, and 235,048 cwt. of refined sugar were exported. The sugar imported gave employment to nearly 141,000 tons of shipping from the West Indies, to 30,000 from Mauritius, to 26,000 from Bengal, and to 36,000 from other sugar-exporting countries. The sugar exported gave employment to about 23,000 tons of shipping sailing to our colonies in the West Indies and North America, to Russia, Prussia, the Netherlands, Spain, Italy, and Turkey. It is impossible to state in figures the amount of home labour set in motion by the purchase, manufacture, and transport of so large a quantity of sugar. The 3,594,832 cwt. of 1840, the 4,208,324 cwt. of 1841, and the 4,699,261 cwt. of 1842, represent a corresponding value of British industry. The tonnage employed in the trade is an index of the sailors, ship-builders, provision-dealers, and others to whom it gave employment. The mere refining of the sugar is a considerable manufacture. There is yet another point of view in which sugar falls to be considered—as a source of revenue to the State. The Government revenue derived from this article of consumption alone was, in 1840, 4,449,033*l.*; in 1841, 5,049,189*l.*; in 1842, 4,884,415*l.*

Yet important as this view of it is, there is still another which gives it additional claims on our attention. Thirteen millions of our population are supposed to be daily consumers of this nutritious and healthful article, and their number as well as their power of additional consumption would be increased in proportion as the price placed it more completely within their reach.

The following table will show the average amount of sugar annually retained for consumption during the decennial periods to which it refers, viz.:—

	Population.	Annual average consumption of Sugar for ten years.
1801.....	15,472,048.....	1,062,504 cwt.
1811.....	17,964,303.....	2,712,585 "
1821.....	20,963,666.....	2,297,897 "
1831.....	24,133,412.....	3,423,042 "
1841.....	26,764,761.....	3,923,052 "

Our contemporary, by an ingenious, we will not say unfair, use of the foregoing figures, makes it appear that, "The increase of consumption during the last decennium is rather below the average, although the increase of the population has been rather greater than that of those which preceded it;" whereas, in point of fact, if we compare the last decennium with that which preceded it, we shall find an increased consumption of two-thirds of a pound per head; and if we further compare it with the average of the four decennial periods, including the quantity of sugar consumed in distillation, in the years 1809 to 1814 inclusive, which went before it, we shall discover an increase in favour of the last decennium of more than three pounds per head. The question "What has given this partial check to the extended consumption of sugar?" is therefore unwarranted, and the answer which follows, viz.:—"The conversion of the slave population of the British colonies, into freemen, is of course out of place. The annexed table will show to what extent the supply of sugar for the British market has been affected by the abolition of slavery.

	West India Sugar.	East India and Mauritius Sugar.	Total.	Average Prices. Duty paid.
Three Years of Slave Labour	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.	s. d.
1831	4,103,800	654,960	4,758,760	47 8
1832	3,773,456	701,880	4,475,336	52 8½
1833	3,646,205	737,640	4,383,845	53 5½
Three Years of Apprenticeship				
1835	3,524,209	771,880	4,296,089	58 9
1836	3,601,791	720,980	4,322,771	63 8
1837	3,306,775	834,700	4,131,475	61 9½
Three Years of Free Labour.				
1839	2,824,372	1,131,500	3,155,872	63 8½
1840	2,214,764	1,027,080	3,231,844	74 2½
1841	2,151,217	1,955,850	4,107,067	65 3½

But this table does not show the amount retained for home consumption during the years over which it extends. From the years 1831 to 1838, inclusive, there were 4,701,895 cwt. of the sugar imported from British possessions, exported from the United Kingdom to foreign countries, equal on the average to 587,736 cwt. per annum. Since that period, only 21,559 cwt. have been exported. This diminution in the exports between the two periods has arisen from the withdrawal, on the part of Government, of the drawbacks and bounties formerly paid the West Indians for seeking a market abroad for their surplus sugars. The fact is that, with the exception of the year 1840, when the price of sugar ruled very high, owing to a singular combination of causes not likely to occur again, there has been a gradual increase from year to year in the demand for sugar; and that the quantity retained for home consumption in 1841 exceeded that of any former year, having reached to 4,058,431 cwt. We have thought it right to add these facts, overlooked by our contemporary, inasmuch as they form an element in any sound view of the sugar question that may be taken. By comparing the quantities retained for home consumption in the years 1838 and 1839 with 1840, he discovered a deficiency in the latter year, whereupon he remarks, after stating that the deprivation connected with this deficiency fell on the poorer classes, "this stinting of persons who have acquired the habit of using sugar all can feel as an hardship; all can estimate the disagreeable feeling of being obliged to abstain from an accustomed indulgence." We admit the applicability of this remark to the year 1840; but why did not our contemporary look forward to 1841? He had the returns before him; but he used them not. Was this fair? Let us see how his reasoning bears the light of facts. In 1840, the quantity of sugar retained for home consumption was 3,594,832 cwt.; this was 314,828 cwt. less than the quantity of 1838, and 230,767 cwt. less than that of 1839; but the quantity retained for home consumption in 1841, was 464,599 cwt. more than that of 1840; and 149,771 cwt. more than that of 1838, from which it may be inferred that so far from the poorer classes having been stinted of their usual supply, they had a superabundance of sugar at command. But neither is the one nor the other statement correct. In 1840, the middle class, as well as the poor, curtailed their use of sugar in probably an equal degree. Nevertheless, though we have pointed out what we believe to be the inaccuracies and fallacies of our contemporary in the use which he has made of his materials, we sincerely desire with him to place the article of sugar in such quantities and at such a price, within the reach of the poor, as will enable them to use it largely, believing that it would not only tend to increase the quantity of wholesome food, and introduce harmless substitutes for ardent spirits among them, but be of essential advantage to the community at large.

Into the statistical information showing to how great an extent sugar might be made available for distillation and brewing, we need not enter, as it must be perfectly obvious that could it be obtained for these purposes, its consumption might be extended to an immense degree. Neither is it necessary that we should follow our contemporary through his various interesting details on the general sugar trade further than to give, so far as it can be ascertained with tolerable accuracy, the quantity passing through the markets of the importing countries, which is stated to be as follows:—

	Tons.
Great Britain (1842) retained for consumption	193,823
France (1840) colonial retained for consumption, & beet-root	93,500
Holland (1840) imported	110,000
Denmark (1838) imported	4,650
Hamburg (1840) imported	45,300
Prussia and Zollverein (1839) beet-root sugar	6,500
Belgium (1838) colonial and beet-root sugar	30,000
Russia (1840) imported	35,000
(1841) beet-root sugar	7,700
Austria (1841) imported at Trieste	25,120
(1841) beet-root	3,200
United States of North America (1841)	132,000
British Colonies not producing sugar (1839)	18,800
Tons....	706,593

The quantities imported into Italy, Spain and Portugal, Sweden, Eastern and Northern Asia, and South America, are not stated, and cannot therefore be given. The following table, compiled by a gentleman who has access to the best information, will show the stocks of sugar on hand in the leading importing markets of Europe, on the 1st of March, for each of the years 1840, 1841, 1842, and 1843, and will be found useful for reference, as will also the statement of the duties leviable on that article in the same countries, which is added to it:—

Stocks of Sugar in Tons on the 1st of March, 1840—43.

	In 1840.	In 1841.	In 1842.	In 1843.
Holland.....	10,700	16,400	15,550	3,100
Hamburg.....	7,000	5,750	6,750	3,500
Trieste.....	5,600	8,400	2,900	3,950
Antwerp.....	1,000	2,800	4,150	2,000
Havre.....	500	2,500	2,600	7,000
England.....	24,800	36,050	31,950	19,550
	39,875	47,900	43,000	43,500
Total.....	64,675	83,950	74,950	63,050
British Plantation in England..	26,995	27,650	28,200	31,450
Foreign Sugar.....	37,680	56,300	46,750	31,600

Comparative Table of the Duties leviable on the Importation of Sugar into the principal Consuming Countries.

		In shillings per hundredweight.		
		Raw.	Clayed.	Refined.
		s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
GREAT BRITAIN..	West India Colonies..	24s. and 5 percent.		
	British India.....	168 0		
	Mauritius.....	168 0		
	Foreign India.....	32 0
FRANCE.....	Foreign.....	63 0	63 0
	French Colonies average	18 0	25 6	prohibited
	Foreign average.....	31 0	36 0	prohibited
HOLLAND.....		16 6	82 0
GERMAN Customs Union, or	For Refining.	16 0
	Zoll-verein.....	30 0	32 0
AUSTRIA.....	Lumps for Refining under special control	17 0
	For Refining.	14 0
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	For Sale.....	27 0	33 0
		11 6	18 6	28 0

The exporting countries, whence the supply is obtained, are—
 “The British colonies in the West India islands and on the main; the French, Spanish, Danish, and Swedish colonies, and the Brazils. Dutch Guiana, and though sugar is produced in Mexico, Columbia, Guatemala, Peru, and the Northern provinces of La Plata, it is in such small quantities as either to be not exported at all, or to an amount too trifling to tell on the market. Besides these, must be added, British India, the Eastern Archipelago, Siam, the Southern provinces of China, and the Philippine Islands. With the exception of Java and the Philippines, the sugar-cultivation of all the countries east of the Malayan Peninsula is exclusively in the hands of the Chinese. This was also the case till a comparatively recent period in Java and the Philippines; but in the former, the entire command of the trade has been transferred to the Europeans; and in the latter this transference is taking place. In reality, therefore, there are only three classes of sugar exporting countries in the East—British India, Java, and the sugar-countries, chiefly in the hands of Chinese, which supply the North of Asia, and from which a small quantity of sugar finds its way to Europe through Singapore.”

The following statement is given to show the amount of sugar raised for exportation in the countries referred to, viz.:—

British West India Colonies (1842).....	123,600 Tons.
British India (1842).....	46,600
Mauritius (1842).....	33,800
	204,000
Spanish Colonies—Cuba.....	155,000
Porto Rico.....	35,000
Manilla.....	25,000
	215,000
Dutch Colonies—Java.....	60,000
Surinam.....	15,000
	75,000
French Colonies—Guadaloupe, Martinique, Bourbon, and Cayenne.....	86,000
Danish Colonies.....	13,000
Brazil.....	70,000
Siam, Penang, Singapore, (nearly).....	10,000
	673,000

Besides the sugar imported into the United States, which appears to have been 132,000 tons in 1841, the quantity produced there, during the same year, is stated to have been 56,323 tons; but it is expected that, with its rapidly increasing population, it will import more largely than it has hitherto done.

With respect to the British West Indies, it is gratifying for us to perceive that our contemporary agrees with us in thinking that they have passed their crisis. The following tabular statement, and the annexed observations, will show the ground of that opinion:—

Quantities of Produce Imported into Great Britain, from the year 1831 to 1841, both inclusive. (Parl. Paper, No. 293, 1842; pp. 1, 2.)

	Population.	Sugar.	Molasses.	Rum.	Coffee.	Cocoa.
	Slaves.	Cwts.	Cwts.	Galls.	Lbs.	Lbs.
1831	800,000	4,103,800	323,306	7,844,157	20,030,802	1,491,947
1832		3,773,456	553,663	4,713,809	24,673,920	618,215
1833		3,646,205	686,794	5,109,975	19,008,375	2,125,656
1834	Apprentices.	3,843,976	650,366	5,112,400	22,081,490	1,360,355
1835	769,000	3,524,209	507,495	5,453,317	14,852,470	439,447
1836		3,601,791	526,535	4,868,168	18,903,426	1,612,304
1837		3,306,775	575,657	4,418,349	15,577,888	1,847,145
1838	Freemen.	3,520,676	638,007	4,641,210	17,588,655	2,149,637
1839	750,000	2,824,372	474,307	4,021,820	11,485,675	959,641
1840		2,214,764	424,141	3,780,979	12,797,739	2,374,301
1841		2,151,217	430,221	2,770,161	9,927,689	2,920,298

“In 1842 the exports began to increase; and the estimated supplies of sugar from British possessions in 1843, as appears from the following statement, made on the best authority, exceed the supplies of 1842.

Tons.
 From the British West India Colonies, 190,000 hhd. = .. 135,000
 Being an increase of about 12,000 tons upon 1842, and of 30,000 tons upon 1841,

From Mauritius..... 25,000
 From British India..... 60,000

“This continuous increase during 1841, 1842, and 1843, looks as if the tide were turned, and the difficulties immediately attendant upon Emancipation were almost surmounted. The estimated surplus for 1843 from the British West Indies, Mauritius, and the exporting parts of British India, give a total of 220,000 tons; which is more than the average supply for 1830, 1831, and 1832, the three years preceding Emancipation.”

Having disposed of his facts, our contemporary observes:—*First.* That “the actual demand and the actual supply in the sugar-market of the world are at present pretty nearly balanced.” *Second.* That the demand for sugar is increasing; partly in consequence of the mere increase of population, and partly, there is reason to suspect, of new classes acquiring the ability and habit to use sugar. *Third.* That there is no reason to expect that the increase of production in sugar-exporting countries will be more rapid for some time to come than the increase of demand in the sugar-importing countries. *Fourth.* That foolish commercial theories have done much to embarrass the sugar-trade. Other countries have not been wiser than our own. *Fifth.* That under these circumstances, such a reduction on the importation of sugar into the United Kingdom, as would permit prices in England to approximate to the average level of prices throughout the world, would, in the first instance at least, and probably for a considerable length of time, be more apt to raise foreign prices to the English level, than to reduce English prices nearer the level of foreign. *Sixth.* That it is therefore mainly to diminished cost of production that we must look for any speedy and important reduction in the price of sugar. And this brings us at once to the more important branch of the inquiry, as to “the means of making free-labour produce more sugar and at less cost than slave-labour.”

The section which our contemporary devotes to “Slavery and the Slave-trade,” whilst it contains many statements of fact, the full force of which we painfully feel, comprises also many assumptions, the correctness of which we positively deny. We shall reserve ourselves, however, for a separate consideration of these points, as well as of others which have attracted our attention in going through this important paper, and proceed to the consideration of the means for “cheapening free labour, and destroying the demand for slaves;” and of “making the negroes too civilized to sell their fellows, or allow themselves to be sold into slavery, and thus cutting off the supply of slaves.” The British West Indies are to be the seat of the grand experiment in the first instance, and Africa in the second;—the means for effecting it, the introduction of African labourers as cultivators of the soil, and their return to their homes, after a certain period of service bearing with them the fruits of knowledge and civilization.

That the British colonies are well calculated for the experiment, he endeavours to prove by showing their natural fertility, which, he says, rivals that of Cuba and Brazil, whilst it exceeds that of Java and British India. Cuba is represented to produce from 1,150 to 2,172 lbs. sugar per acre; Brazil not more, if indeed so much; Java from 1,285 to 1,815 lbs. of clayed-sugar; and British India 2,122 lbs., one half the quantity being *goor*, three to four parts of which are required to make one part of *chenee*; whereas Jamaica is said to produce 2,000 lbs., and St. Vincent, Antigua, and Barbadoes, 3,000 lbs. per acre, and Trinidad and Guiana are quoted as more productive still. Of course, in giving these figures, we do not vouch for their accuracy. Our impression is, that the soil of Cuba, as well as a considerable portion of the sugar lands of India and Java, are equally fertile with those of the most productive of the British colonies. If this really be so, the argument attempted to be built on the superior fertility of our colonies falls to the ground; and we must, therefore, look not to this point alone, but to its vicinity to markets and facilities of transit, whether its cultivation will be profitable. Now, our contemporary observes, we have these in our colonies, together with capital and machinery to a greater extent than elsewhere; and that the two latter may be increased indefinitely, if there be but labour to render them profitable. The next point adverted to is the actual condition of the colonies through British legislation. Under this section our contemporary puts forth his strength to prove that the great diminution of the produce which took place between 1833 and 1841, “was occasioned by the consequences of emancipation alone;” and that, at the time the produce fell off, “the remuneration of the labourers, even of the occasional labourers, continued at a rate high beyond the parallel of any country at any time past or present.”

The glaring want of truth and the absurd exaggeration of these statements, must be apparent to all persons competent to form a correct opinion of the real facts of the case, or who will take the pains of mastering them. But to this subject we shall return at our leisure, and proceed to points on which there can be no dispute. The value of imports into the British colonies in 1839, from all parts of the world, was 5,867,820*l.*, and of exports, 6,436,363*l.*; into Mauritius, imports, 865,461*l.*, exports, 780,042*l.* This does not look like ruin, or that the capital vested in the colonies “must be wantonly and extravagantly destroyed, by allowing matters to remain as they are.” Does not our contemporary know, or need

he be told, "that the deficiency in the quantity," to use the language of Lord Stanley, "had been made up by the increased value of the produce in the different intervals. For instance, the average value of sugar for the six years preceding the apprenticeship was 5,320,021*l.*, and that for the four years of the apprenticeship was 6,217,801*l.*; in the first year of freedom the amount was 5,530,000*l.*; and in the next year 5,424,000*l.*; and although this year (1842) there would be a large reduction, still there would be a fair remuneration for what was lost by diminution of produce." In this latter statement, his lordship was wrong, the quantity of produce, instead of being much less than that of 1841, exceeded it by 16,500 tons.

"The labouring class have a monopoly of the labour-market," this is the cry now that the planters have not a monopoly of the persons of the labourers. While they coerced them by the whip, while they wrung from their sinews the toil which enriched them, and returned blows for gold, while they spared neither age nor sex to glut their lust of wealth, and love of power, little was said by our contemporaries in their behalf; but now, after their masters have received 20,000,000*l.* of British gold, with interest to boot, and have not lost, but gained by the sale of their produce in the British market, and withal have been made honest men, he is loud in his cry of "No Monopoly" in the labour-market." Let there be competition—a sufficient supply of labour to beat down its price to the minimum point—in other words, let swarms of Africans be introduced at the public expense of the colonies, to benefit the planters,—place them within a ring fence—make land scarce and dear to them—realize the visions of Mr. Edward Gibbon Wakefield in the British Colonies,—and you shall uproot slavery wherever it exists, suppress the slave trade, civilize Africa, and benefit the world. We doubt it, and shall give our reasons for so thinking in our next.

PROGRESS OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY CAUSE IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE following letter from our Boston correspondent, a gentleman intimately conversant with the subjects on which he writes, will be read with great satisfaction. Other communications which we have received from New York and other parts of the United States are equally cheering. They call upon us to watch the movements of the southern slave-holding party, whose great object now is the annexation of Texas to the Union, and to use our most strenuous efforts to prevent the restoration of fugitive slaves charged with criminal acts to their masters. We need not say that on both these great subjects we entirely concur with our friends, and bid them persevere in their noble course and prosper.

To the Editor of the Anti-Slavery Reporter.

Boston, April 1, 1843.

SIR,—The aspects of our glorious cause were never so cheering in our country as at this time. The treaty of Washington has totally destroyed the power of the slave-holders and their northern allies to plunge your country and ours into a war for the protection of slavery and the slave-trade. There will probably be a good deal of altercation for years to come, but no war. Every attempt in Congress to create an effective opposition to the treaty failed. In the Senate, Benton's motion to strike out of the appropriation bill the allowance for the African squadron of eighty guns, was supported by only five votes. In the House of Representatives, the bill for carrying into effect the other provisions of the treaty was carried without a division, and almost without debate. The only noticeable circumstance in the brief discussion which took place was the remark of Mr. Cushing, that "the United States had ample cause to regret that they had ever given in to sentimental legislation;" that "we had taken a false step when we gave a false name to the slave-trade;" for "the only debateable point in this whole matter was a question under the law of nations, which might arise on the piracy statute." Mr. Cushing then expected to become a member of Mr. Tyler's cabinet, but the Senate rejected his nomination. He is now returned to his old district in Massachusetts, where the Liberty party has hitherto prevented a choice of representatives, and is now waiting an opportunity to present himself to the people for a re-election to Congress. The only paper that now sustains his pretensions, in publishing the speech above referred to, left out the paragraph from which I have quoted! a striking testimony to the spirit of liberty! In the legislature of the state of Maine, a series of resolutions condemnatory of the treaty were rejected by an overwhelming majority. This shows how hopeless is the effect to reproduce exasperation on this subject. The nice point, relating to the right of visit, will, I think, gradually become cleared up by the discussions, so as to bring the parties together; especially as the design of the slavery party in France and the United States to restore the slave-trade shall become more manifest to the world. With this subject, the African emigration schemes of your countrymen, and the Texian annexation project of ours, are both intimately connected. The utter failure of all schemes for the suppression of the slave-trade which have been resorted to, both in your country and ours, will ultimately drive all true philanthropists to one policy, that of remedying the evil by removing its cause—slavery.

The tone of the slaveholders in Congress during the late session was materially different from that which hitherto prevailed. They no longer evinced that overbearing and dictatorial manner which had formerly caused so much disgust, but rather took the attitude of complainers, whining, and begging for pity and protection. Nothing could provoke them to make a speech; so that, with the single exception of a speech by Mr. Cushing, in reply to Mr. Giddings, the latter had the debate entirely to himself. It is impossible now to foresee what will be the temper of the next Congress. As it will contain an overwhelming majority of the democratic party, called "the natural allies of the planters," it is probable enough the slaveholders will reap some advantage, but it will be short-lived.

The legislature of Massachusetts have passed all the measures that were prepared in consequence of the Latimer case, and passed them too without division or debate. An act to prohibit the officers of the

State from taking any part in the recapture of alleged fugitives from slavery, and denying the use of our jails for their detention; an act repealing the intermarriage prohibition which was enacted by our ancestors a century ago to prevent connexions with heathens; a resolution authorising the Governor to employ agents and prosecute suits to vindicate the rights of coloured citizens imprisoned in southern seaports; resolutions against the annexation of Texas; and resolutions demanding an alteration in the United States constitution, so far as it allows the southern states an additional number of representatives in Congress for their slave property, all passed by the general consent of both parties. The tardiness of the democratic legislature of New York to comply with the advice of Governor Bouck, in reference to fugitive slaves, and humble the state to the dictation of Virginia, evinces the force of public opinion which restrains the servility of unprincipled politicians. The democratic legislature of Maine has passed resolutions for the protection of coloured seamen in southern seaports. What is your government doing on this subject?

The legislature of Ohio have repealed the base statute, enacted some years since at the dictation of the legislature of Kentucky, rendering it highly penal to afford aid or sustenance to a fugitive from slavery. To balance this, however, they have passed an act prohibiting the children of coloured persons from attending the public schools, although the parents are taxed for their support. They have also virtually overthrown a decision of their supreme Court, that persons of a lighter hue than mulatto (half-blood) are entitled to vote and to give testimony, the same as white persons. This shows how the elements are stirring. A person has recently been convicted in that state of kidnapping a free person, who was carried across the Ohio river into Kentucky, and sold as a slave. This is the first case of conviction in that state, and it was effected by the efforts of William Birney, Esq., Cincinnati, attorney-at-law, the second son of our honoured James G. Birney.

These movements in the political and civil circles are accompanied, *pari passu*, by corresponding advances in the press, and in the religious communities. The number of churches declining communion with slaveholders is constantly on the increase; and the tone of sentiment in our newspapers, both secular and religious, in all questions connected with slavery, is manifestly rising towards the true standard.

George Latimer, the fugitive from slavery, whose case created so much interest, is lecturing in this state. The two Clarkes, from Kentucky, white slaves, having no other title to liberty than the seal of the Almighty on their manly foreheads, are lecturing with great effect, Lewis in the state of Maine, and Milton in the state of New York.

Efforts are making to send a respectable delegation to the London Convention. I have already heard that the following persons expect to attend:—Rev. H. H. Kellogg, President of Galesville College, Illinois; Rev. J. W. C. Pennington, Hartford Conn.; William Shotwell, Esq., New York City; and the Revs. Joshua Leavitt, Nathaniel Colver, Amos A. Phelps, of Boston, Massachusetts.

There will doubtless be others. There is a division taking place in the Methodist Episcopal Church, connected with the question of slavery, which bids fair to push that great branch of our religious community to take higher ground on the whole subject. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions is in difficulty with the missionaries of the Sandwich Islands, on the same account. It is believed that the sensitiveness of the managers of that society on the subject does not grow out of a desire to secure pecuniary support from the South, for only a very small amount is realized; but rather from the fact that so many impartial members and friends of the Board at the North have unluckily committed themselves against the doctrines of the inherent sinfulness of slave-holding, and the imperative duty of immediate emancipation, and hence the pride of consistency requires them not to yield any thing to abolition. Let us hope they may learn that for a Christian to acknowledge error is noble.

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE FRENCH COLONIES.

THIS great event, which has been so long delayed, is about, we trust, receiving its accomplishment. The Report of the Commission presided over by the Duc de Broglie has been presented to the Chambers, and appears to have created a great sensation. Like every thing from the pen of that eminent individual, it is characterized by great power and eloquence, though we deeply regret to say that its conclusions and recommendations are opposed to immediate and entire emancipation. Our correspondent informs us that the Report is followed by three projects of law, of which the following statement will give some idea:—

First. That slavery shall finally cease on the 1st January, 1853; but that, in the meantime, the slaves shall continue in the performance of their accustomed labours for ten years, subject to certain ameliorations in their condition of a civil, religious, and moral character. This system of transition is to be followed by a kind of serfage, which is to last five years, at the termination of which they are to be declared completely free. The compensation to the owners is to be 150,000,000 francs; and this sum, added to 150,000,000 francs more, the estimated value of the labour of the slaves during the ten years of the transition system, will make 300,000,000 francs or 12,000,000*l.* sterling, in all. The 150,000,000 francs, with the interest of 4 per cent. accruing, is to be paid in the year 1857. The majority of the Commission are in favour of this scheme.

Second. That there shall be a progressive emancipation of all children born subsequently to the 1st January, 1838. This would be completed, on the principle laid down, in 1862, and would be attended with a cost of 70,000,000 francs. In that year it is estimated there will be 60,000 slaves remaining, whose purchase would be provided for by a second law. This scheme has the approval of the minority of the Commission.

Third. That a law for the political organization of the colonies should be passed, which would suppress the legislative powers of their councils, and would give them instead seven deputies in the French Chambers.

At present it is not known whether the French Cabinet will consent to bring either of those projects before the Chambers, during the present session. M. Guizot is represented as favourable to its being done; but is opposed by the Minister of the Colonies, Admiral Roussin. There is some talk of separating the Colonial from the Marine Department, and conferring it upon some other minister. The French Abolition Society is about to meet for the purpose of deliberating on the two first projects. We trust the noble-minded men who compose it will feel it to be their duty to base their proceedings on those high principles of justice which will prevent them from compromising the cause of the oppressed to meet the clamours of the colonists on the one hand, or the temporising policy of mere statesmen on the other.

NOTICES.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER is an Evening Paper, published on alternate Wednesdays, and may be had of all News-venders throughout the country. Price 4d., or 8s. 8d. per annum.

ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

THE arrangements for the second general Anti-Slavery Convention are now complete. The venerable THOMAS CLARKSON has accepted the unanimous and cordial invitation of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, to be its President. Freemasons' Hall has been secured for its sittings. The meetings of the delegates for business will commence on Tuesday, the 13th June next, at ten o'clock in the morning, and be continued from day to day (Sunday excepted) until it is closed. On Wednesday, the 21st June, the fourth Anniversary of the British and Foreign Society will be held at Exeter Hall, as an appropriate termination of the proceedings of the Convention, when the friends of the anti-slavery cause from various countries will have a public opportunity of bearing their united testimony against the continuance of slavery and the slave-trade.

The Anti-Slavery Reporter.

LONDON, APRIL 19, 1843.

It must be apparent, we think, to all who have paid attention to the late debates, in both Houses of Parliament, on the Washington Treaty, that great difference of opinion exists as to the true extent and meaning of the article referring to the slave-trade. Interpreted by the President of the United States, it means the abandonment by Great Britain of "the right of visit" so determinedly claimed by Lords Palmerston and Aberdeen in their official capacity of Foreign Ministers, and so vehemently and peremptorily denied by Mr. Stevenson, as the representative of the United States at the British Court. Interpreted by Sir Robert Peel, the present head of Her Majesty's Government, it means no such thing: Great Britain has not and will not give up the right. The Message to Congress and the speech in Parliament look very awkward side by side. But after all it appears that "the apparent difference between the two Governments is rather one of definition than of principle." This was a happy thought of President Tyler's, and it has been skilfully used in Parliament for the purpose of avoiding unpleasant discussions. Now we shall consider "the apparent difference" to be one "of principle," and not "one of definition," until the head of the great North American Republic concedes the right of the navy of this country to visit vessels on the high seas bearing "the star-spangled banner," under the limitations proposed. But not only was this difference of opinion apparent between the distinguished individuals referred to, noble Lords and Right Hon. Gentlemen took opposite views, some affirming it to be a practical settlement of existing difficulties of a delicate and difficult point, and open to no objection on the point of obscurity, whilst others affirmed it was of "doubtful interpretation," and "a retrograde step" on the great question of the slave-trade. We fear that this subject will again come up for discussion in a form more perplexing still; and such an interpretation put upon it, as the most skilful diplomacy will not be able to reconcile with peace.

On another point great difference of opinion was also apparent, viz., as to the most certain means of putting down the slave trade. Some relied on the efficacy of treaties, backed by a naval force. Others despaired of this means, unless the United States and France would join in a "holy alliance" for this purpose, and concede, the former "the right of search," and the latter, larger limits within which vessels bearing her flag, and suspected of slave-trading, might be searched. Others would superadd to the right of search the necessity of the powers of Europe and America declaring the slave-trade to be piracy, whilst more than one believed the destruction of the slave-barracoons on the coast of Africa, and the blockade of the rivers of Africa, are necessary to accomplish the great object in view. What does this prove? Why the extent and the inveteracy of the evil. Lord Palmerston, we think, took the right ground when he said that, "so long as slavery continued to exist in any country whatever, they would have endeavours to carry it on; and nothing would put an end to it effectually but the extinction of the condition of slavery." There is a growing conviction in the public mind of this and of other countries, that this is the true doctrine.

But it may be asked, "How can this be done?" We reply, in reference to Brazil and Spain, by carrying into effect the stipulations of the treaties which exist. By this means an incredible number of slaves, illicitly introduced into the territories or colonies of these countries must be liberated; and the time is now fully come, unless the treaties are to continue worse than a dead letter, to enforce a

claim not less founded in humanity and justice than on the faith of the most positive engagements, and the declarations of the most solemn laws.

On the case of the *Creole*, which occupied so large a share in the debates, we cannot but regret the tone of one of the most eloquent assertors of human rights, Lord Brougham. Concession of principle to meet the unlawful demands of slave-holders! Never will the people of this country consent to this. Whatever they may not know of the niceties of law either local or general, they know that every part of the British dominions should be sacred to freedom, and that help and succour should be given to the oppressed, rather than to the oppressor. If it be not presumption in us to say it, we maintain that the United States Government have no jurisdiction over slaves. They cannot interfere for the recovery of slaves that have fled from one State to another. Much less can they claim slaves who, by any means, have found their way beyond the boundaries of the Republic. The moment slaves are out of the bounds of the United States, on the high seas, they are free, and can secure their freedom, by steering to a British port rather than to Savannah or New Orleans. Would the noble Lord deprive them of that right? No—his past labours in the Anti-slavery cause forbid the thought. If our doctrine be correct, and it is confirmed by Judge Storey, to whom Lord Campbell paid so just a tribute of respect, when referring to the law affecting the case of the *Creole*, then, with all possible respect, we think his Lordship, when Attorney-General, ought not to have yielded to the demands of Mr. Stevenson, for compensation for the slaves of the *Comet* and *Encomium*, wrecked on the Bahamas. On this point we should like his Lordship to see the report of the debate on the appropriation of the money paid over to the United States' Government from the British treasury. Mr. Giddings, of Ohio, challenged the Government to prove by what right they had demanded that compensation, and incontestably proved that none such existed; and that a gross fraud had been practised by Mr. Van Buren's administration on this country, in order to obtain it. The hon. gentleman's triumphant speech was unanswered.

In an official report made to the United States Government in 1842, by Commanders Charles H. Bell and James Paine, respecting the slave-trade, they state that though they have "little knowledge of the details respecting the slave-trade on the eastern coast of Africa;" yet that from the best information they could obtain, "it seems that a large trade is carried on by the Portuguese colonies, the Arab chiefs, and negro tribes;" and observe, that "their greatest markets are the Mahometan countries bordering on the Red Sea and Persian Gulf, the Portuguese East India colonies, Bombay, and perhaps other British possessions in the East Indies;" and, they add, "this part of the trade is probably in the hands of the Arabian vessels." The correctness of this Report, so far as the traffic with British possessions in India was concerned, Mr. Stuart Wortley, in his place in the House of Commons on the 10th inst., appeared to deny, and appealed to Sir Robert Peel in confirmation of the view he took of the subject. The answer of the right hon. baronet went to implicate some of the native states in this detestable traffic, but not our own territories,—except in a few individual cases, which it was difficult to prevent, he said it was not carried on with British India. In justice to the two naval officers of the United States, we feel bound to state that their Report, whencesoever they obtained their information, was substantially correct. A few extracts from official documents will prove this. In the papers laid before Parliament in 1839 (No. 138) relative to slavery in India, we find that "considerable numbers of slaves were introduced into British India through the native states of Kattewar, Cutch, and Scinde, and the Portuguese possessions of Goa, Din, and Dumaon, under the usual revolting circumstances, (vide pp. 107—150, *passim*.) And this statement rests not on equivocal or uncertain testimony, but on the evidence afforded the Government by the servants of the Company, Messrs. Willoughby and Reed, and Capt. Brucks, of the Indian navy, in their official capacity. The latter gentleman says, "numbers of slaves are brought into Surat as well as other ports in the Nawaub territories," and adds, that a "very large portion of these slaves, there is no doubt, are imported into the British territory."

Nor was the evil confined to Bombay. Into Calcutta, the seat of the Supreme Government, slaves were introduced, as we find by the admission of the Secretary of the Marine Board, who says, "into Calcutta, from the Persian Gulf and other ports," slaves had been introduced; and that "the traffic may go on to some extent" . . . "without the police knowing any thing about it," (pp. 219, 220.) With respect to Madras, it is remarked, that the domestic slave population consists, among others, of "kidnapped" persons—"natives of Arabia, but chiefly of Abyssinia." These are introduced by Mussulmen who resort to "Hyderabad and other ports where the traffic is not prohibited;" and, it is added, that "Abyssinian slaves are generally their (Mahometans) favourite menials." (Par. Pap. No. 128, 1834, p. 11; and No. 138, 1839, p. 400.) And it may be observed, that with respect to the Bombay and Madras Presidencies, the whole line of the western coast of India, by its proximity to the coast of Africa and Arabia, and to the ports of the Red Sea, presents facilities for importation, which are increased by the existence on the coast of the Portuguese settlements already referred to. That the Arab and native chiefs are largely engaged in slave-trading needs no proof. The facts are palpable and lamentable.

Until the last year there existed, at least in the opinion of the Supreme Government of India, no effectual means for the repression of this traffic and the punishment of its abettors; when an Act of the Imperial Legislature was passed, to extend the provisions of the

Consolidated Slave-trade Abolition Act of 1824 to all parts of British India. This will do something; but we look to the entire abolition of slavery in British India as the only sure guarantee of the suppression of the slave-trade; and most thankful are we to say, that hopes may now be indulged that this will be soon accomplished, Sir Robert Peel having confirmed the fact of the promulgation of the Act referred to in our Number of the 22nd of March, which has now become law.

In reference to slavery in the British settlements in the East, the complete abolition of which we have announced to our readers as having been accomplished, we have to observe, that, in this particular, we were mistaken: the great event is to take place in May next, as may be seen from the annexed draft Act "for declaring the illegality of slavery throughout the straits' settlements," viz. :—

"Whereas in certain parts of the straits' settlements slavery has never had any legal existence, and in the other parts, in which it is doubtful whether formerly it had such legal existence, it is no longer warranted by custom, or the supposed rights connected therewith have been expressly abandoned,

"It is hereby declared and enacted, that in no part of the straits' settlements shall the status of slavery be recognised as existing by law. And all courts and officers of law are hereby prohibited from enforcing any claims founded on any supposed rights of masters in regard to slaves within the settlements aforesaid, and are enjoined to afford protection to all persons against whom any supposed rights of slavery are attempted to be enforced.

"Ordered, that the Draft now read be published for general information.

"Ordered, that the said Draft be reconsidered at the first meeting of the legislative council of India after the 1st day of May next."

When the official reports are received, we shall, of course, return to the full consideration of the measures proposed by Government for the extinction of slavery throughout our dominions in the East, and consider how far they are calculated to insure that great object.

Parliamentary Intelligence.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—Friday, April 7th, 1843.
CASE OF THE CREOLE.—RIGHT OF SEARCH, &c.

LORD BROUGHAM would now turn to the case of the *Creole*, which also was one of an unfortunate nature. With regard to the case of the *Creole*, he would appeal to any one who remembered the feeling in that House and elsewhere out of doors a year and a half ago, when that feeling prevailed, and ask them whether anything could be conceived more calculated to encumber the progress of the negotiations between the two countries than that question? He remembered having a great deal of discussion before his noble friend (Lord Ashburton) went out, on the importance and difficulty of the question with regard to the points of law involved in it, and he recollected that his feeling at that time was, that it would be very difficult to deal with the subject of the *Creole* without our granting something, and something which it might be extremely painful to us to concede, but which, at the same time, it might be impossible for us to refuse on the subject of slavery, on which point any concession would be still less agreeable to the more excited and less reflecting minds of the British public. The case was this:—The American coast, in the southern states, lay in the Gulf of Florida, in a very narrow channel, which channel was studded with islands the property of this country. Every one of these islands the American ships engaged in the coasting must constantly pass. Now the voyages which they were in the constant habit of making from one part of the country to another were precisely their means of internal communication, much more so than our communication by means of coasting vessels from Newcastle to the Thames, although this extent would perhaps suffice for his argument. In this part of America, however, the common mode of internal communication was by the coast, especially since the invention of steam. How were these coasting ships manned? There might perhaps be two or three freemen on board, but all the rest of the crew were slaves. What was the consequence? Why, that the passage from one southern province to another—the journey from one parish to another—the internal traffic—the ordinary everyday communication, could not be carried on without exposing part of these slaves to difficulties arising out of the principle laid down in the case of the *Creole*. The Americans might have said, "You must give us some security that your seamen shall not be able to take these vessels of ours navigating from parish to parish into one of your islands, because the instant they touch it every one of these by law becomes free." Nay, they may take the ship away, or man a boat and carry her off, and yet be in nowise guilty of piracy, because they have a right to escape from slavery which our laws do not recognise, and it is no piratical act which is necessary for the attainment of such an end. Yet the result of the negotiations were more satisfactory in this case than in the case of the *Caroline*, for no demand whatever was made. America acted as though she saw and appreciated our difficulties in so delicate a subject as slavery, and made no demand whatever, save, of course, a stipulation that there should be no conspiracy to decoy or harbour these slaves. But a most important concession was obtained from America, who for the first time had made, he rejoiced to say, a clear, distinct, and unqualified admission, through their Government, representing not only the good men of the north and middle states, where slavery happily did not tarnish the banner of a free republic, but representing also the slave owners of the south—aye, representing those men, the greatest enemies of negro emancipation that ever existed; he said it with regret, a friend as he was to liberty, and an admirer to a certain extent, when the people were adapted to it and circumstances were harmoniously disposed, of a republican form of government. Nevertheless, by them and by their Government was this unqualified admission made, for the first time, by which the fetters were struck from the limbs of the slave for ever. This had been stipulated for, and there was also in the course of execution a treaty (and a most important one it undoubtedly was) of extradition, by which the criminals of one were under certain limitations to be surrendered by the authorities of the other. The noble Lord then went on to observe,—that the right of search never formed a

subject of discussion during the late negotiations; that neither could any concession be required by the United States, nor any made by Great Britain. Notwithstanding this, however, there were still found men who maintained that we had abandoned the right of search. The fact was that we had nothing to ask, for we had it all our own way. We did not claim the right to search American vessels, in the proper and technical sense of the word, because we had no treaty with America, as we had with France, by which a search was permitted with certain too narrow limitations. America had never conceded this point, and we never claimed it, so that there could be no question between us on that head. Even though the vessel should be brimfull of slaves, every one of whom had been put aboard by an act of piracy, accompanied, in all probability, by murder as well as pillage, and attended by the most grievous inflictions of cruelty—even though each of these men on board the ship were a pirate, and liable to the penalty of piracy under his own Government, still we had no right to stop her if she were truly American. But what was the proposition? That an American vessel was only answerable to her own Government for breaking its laws, and we had no right to search her, no right to stop her, though caught in the flagrant delict of piracy and murder. Such was the proposition, such the meaning of the right of search. In concluding his remarks, the noble Lord contended that the opinions of the British and United States Governments, on this subject, were substantially the same, President Tyler having suggested that the apparent difference between them was rather "one of definition than of principle."

The Earl of ABERDEEN remarked, it was asserted that a retrograde movement was made by the eighth article, with regard to the slave-trade. He thought, on the contrary, that America had made an advance towards the extinction of that traffic in that article. The commissioners at Sierra Leone made a proposition in 1839 similar to that embodied in the eighth article to the United States, which was rejected. It was said that the President of the United States took a different view of the clause from Her Majesty's Government; but, after the able observations of the noble and learned lord, he did not think it necessary to dwell on that topic. There was no right of search save what was conceded by treaty; but a vessel could be visited when suspicion existed as to its nationality, and this appeared to him the view taken by the President in his message. He must confess that the United States had reason to complain of some pretensions on our side put forth, and the manner in which they were carried out. So lately as the month of February, 1841, the noble Lord lately at the head of the Foreign-office gave instructions that Her Majesty's cruisers should abstain from capturing American vessels; because before that time it had been the practice of our cruisers to capture them, and the commissioners at Sierra Leone had, on many occasions, found themselves placed in great difficulty in consequence, and had often refused to adjudicate. The people of the United States, therefore, were warranted in supposing that we claimed the right to capture American vessels. He had no doubt that the conjoint efforts of our officers and those of the United States would put an end to all difficulties. He had no doubt that they would co-operate on the coast of Africa, as they had always done in all services in which they had hitherto been engaged, with perfect cordiality and good-will. It had also been asserted that another retrograde step had been made by a letter addressed by him (Lord Aberdeen) to the Lords of the Admiralty, about a year ago, referring to certain proceedings on the coast of Africa. All he could say in reply to this was, that he had consulted the law officers of the Crown, and had been informed that the proceedings to which that letter referred could not be maintained by the laws of nations; it was therefore his duty of course to forbid them. And he should like to know how this could be called taking a retrograde step, when he had just informed their lordships that it was only in February, 1841, that the capture of American vessels was desisted from. And why was it desisted from, but that it was discovered to be contrary to the law of nations? And this fact had induced him to address the letter to the Admiralty. But in those minutes nothing further was intended than to praise the exertions which had been made so meritoriously by our cruisers on the coast. If it were possible to suppose that this country could alone effect the abolition of the slave-trade by her single exertions, they might deal with these questions more easily; but it was undoubtedly the fact, that our only chance of effecting the abolition of that traffic was by acting in concert with other nations, and therefore it became extremely important, in the execution of this duty, that we should do nothing to outrage the rights of independent nations, or to violate public justice. Keeping that in view, therefore, every exertion that could possibly be made would be made for that purpose; and he was sure that noble lords opposite would believe that Her Majesty's Government were fully disposed to exercise their power; and he trusted that, so far from any retrograde step being taken in this cause, that they had made a great advance, and the article of this treaty which had been found fault with would operate practically as an important addition to our means of terminating the traffic in slaves. The noble and learned lord had so fully exhausted this and all other parts of the subject, that he did not think it necessary to detain their lordships at that late hour of the night.

LORD CAMPBELL, in opposition to Lord Brougham, maintained that the case of the *Creole*, however, remained unsettled, and great difficulties might yet be encountered in obtaining a settlement of that question. Disputes, too, had arisen as to slaves on board ships coming into our ports in stress of weather. His noble and learned friend seemed to desire to palliate the conduct of the American Government in respect to this internal slave trade, for his noble and learned friend would represent to their lordships that American ships passed through the Gulf of Florida which had no slaves, but a few hands only, who were happy to be there as seamen on board. In the cases of the *Comet* and the *Encornium* compensation was given. After slavery had been abolished in the British empire, the ship *Enterprise* was driven into Bermuda, in 1837, with a cargo of slaves, which were ultimately liberated. Compensation was, however, claimed by the American Government. He had the honour of being then Attorney-General, and he took great pains of inquiring most minutely into the case with the view of arriving at a clear conclusion. He was of opinion that no compensation could be paid, for as slavery had been then wholly abolished they could not be any longer considered as slaves when they had entered a British port. That if those slaves were detained in custody an action could be brought and damages could be obtained. Mr. Webster, as in

the case of the *Creole*, endeavoured to show with much ingenuity that those slaves ought not to have been liberated. The reasoning of Mr. Webster went so far as to show that Somerset, the negro, ought to have been kept in captivity. It should, however, be recollected that the law of England and America was the same in this respect. Mr. Justice Story, who was one of the best authorities on law points since the immortal Blackstone, said that slavery was a local law, therefore the instant that slaves had got beyond the limits where slavery was recognised their chains were broken, they had escaped from imprisonment and were free. There was not now the slightest distinction between Bermuda and Portsmouth. Lord Ashburton should have asserted the same high principles that the Government had acted on in the case of the *Enterprise*. But what did the noble Lord say? He, no doubt, was not aware of the concession he was making when he was writing on this subject. Instead of repudiating the demand that had been made upon him, he said, "This question had much better be treated with in London, where there was a much more increased chance of a settlement in such terms as were likely to satisfy the Government of the United States." This was a style which implied a kind of acquiescence to the demand. The noble Lord went on to say, "Although I believe much would be done to meet the wishes of the United States, the means of doing so it was much better should be considered in London than any other place." The noble Lord then handed over Mr. Webster to the noble Earl (Aberdeen,) to devise some means by which the slaves could be still continued in chains. He (Lord Campbell) deprecated any cause of quarrel between this country and America; but if they were to have such a quarrel, he could not wish a holier quarrel than that which originated in a refusal to make compensation for the liberated slaves who had received their freedom from their courts of justice. Such a cause would be upheld by mankind, and receive the blessing of Heaven. The eighth article of the treaty was in reference to the right of visit and the right of search. The right of search was that which gave them the power of stopping all vessels that were engaged in an unlawful trade. The right of visit had been admirably defined by the noble Earl opposite, in his letters to Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Everett. This right had been denied by these two gentlemen, and by President Tyler in his first and second message to Congress, and the ground of that denial was said to rest on the authority of Sir Wm. Scott. But the expressions of Sir Wm. Scott applied to the right of search, detention, and condemnation, and he said no such thing as that in time of peace the right did not exist of visiting to determine the nationality of a flag. Now what was said on the part of America in the message of the President, upon which his noble friend relied? President Tyler, in his first message to Congress, represented that this country had set up a right entirely contrary to law, and had been obliged to abandon it. Amongst other things, he said, "I therefore, felt it to be my duty distinctly to declare in my annual message to Congress, that no such concession could be made, and that the United States have both the will and the ability to enforce their own law and to protect their flag. In close conformity with this view the eighth article of the treaty was framed. From this it will be seen that the ground assumed in the message has been fully maintained;" and then he went on to say that the object would be gained without the interpolation of any new principle. Therefore, the right to visit, which the noble Earl so lauded, was declared to be an interpolation of the law of nations, which must be exploded. In the second message the President still denied the existence of that right, saying they might grant it if they pleased, or they might withhold it. The noble and learned Lord said he would undertake to show that there was not a shadow of difference between the two Governments on the subject. But there was this difference—that the Americans said it was a trespass, and that this country said it was a right. If so, then resistance would be unlawful; but if it were a trespass, then the attempt would be unlawful. If it were a right, those who resisted it would be guilty of murder. If it were a trespass, those who tried to enforce it would be guilty of murder. There had been repeated trials in which this point had arisen, and at the Admiralty Sessions thirty persons charged with murder were defended by Dr. Lushington on one occasion, and thirty-three on another. This right was also denied in the last message of the President. It was not only denied, but the message went much further, for it said you shall not examine a ship with the American flag, although it may be falsely assumed. Without the right of visit it would be impossible to put an end to the slave-trade—(hear, hear). The treaties of Lord Ashburton in this respect had entirely failed to induce them to agree to the right of search, and the eighth article had been substituted for it. That article had most materially tended to injure our influence, and it had been made use of to induce France, not only to refuse to assent to the last treaty, but for the purpose of rescinding those which had been previously entered into.

Lord COLCHESTER, as having been practically engaged in the execution of the treaties for the suppression of the slave trade, would offer a few observations to their lordships. He had commanded a frigate on the coast of South America for preventing the slave trade, and he could state that it was usual to visit every vessel of a suspicious appearance, and that there never was any complaint made. The outcry about the right of search was raised not on its merits, but for political purposes. The right of search had been given up by the noble earl then Secretary for Foreign Affairs, but the right of visit was still maintained. The eighth article of this treaty, so far from being a retrograde step with regard to the slave trade, afforded strong hopes of putting a speedy end to that trade.

Lord DENMAN thought that the settlement of the important differences with respect to the boundary question and the *Caroline* ought to afford such satisfaction, that they should not enter into very minute inquiries as to whether better terms ought not to be obtained in some particulars. He thought that the noble earl had gone further in the directions which he had issued to the governors of the colonies than any negotiation would have authorised, because the laws must be exercised according to their exigencies; and any Government who would warp the laws for any such purpose would deserve to be impeached as deserting the most important of its duties. He must enter his protest against the expression of Lord Ashburton; and thought that no Parliament in England; however powerful a Ministry might be, would ever be persuaded to alter the law in the slightest degree for such a purpose. He had not been prepared to hear the noble earl treat the letter addressed by the Admiralty to the cruisers

on the African station in the way which he had done. It seemed to him to be a question of justice as well to the individuals concerned as to the public generally whether such a letter ought to have been written. He stood there for the natural rights which belonged to them, and he thought they ought not to tamper with the slave trade as conferring any rights at all. He considered it as an enormous crime which all mankind were bound to prevent. Though it had been always regarded in that light, and though it had been frequently denounced with the most powerful eloquence, yet he feared it had not been sufficiently considered in that light, for if it was that gigantic evil the consequence would be that all nations would have a right to prevent the kidnapping of their fellow-creatures as much as they would to prevent a murder, and that every man was guilty of a crime who allowed it to pass in his presence without attempting to prevent it. All the laws and treaties which once gave a sanction to this trade were now abrogated, and every civilised nation had agreed to suppress it. What then remained but to enforce the duty which was imposed on all who acknowledged those principles for carrying them into effect? He would not enter into the question of the right of search, or the right of visit. He stood there for the right of prevention. He would say that every restriction on human beings to prevent such a crime was an abandonment of the duty which was incumbent on all men, and particularly on England, who owed retribution to Africa for her former conduct with regard to the slave trade. It had been said that the mode of rewarding cruisers for the capture of slavers led to the suffering the slavers to put their human cargoes on board without molestation; but he was informed that there was not the slightest ground for believing that the British officers engaged in the suppression of the trade were actuated by the feelings which it was once supposed influenced them. He believed that every one of them was actuated with the utmost zeal to put an end to the traffic. It was clear that when a cargo of human beings was placed on board a vessel half the mischief was done. The slavers had a chance of escaping to their markets, and chasing them was frequently accompanied with murder, numbers of the poor victims being thrown overboard to lighten the load. He thought that the officer, who, on his own responsibility, went on shore and destroyed the barracoons, entitled himself to the approbation of the country, and that the slave trade was more effectually suppressed by that act than by anything else; and he could not understand how the Admiralty could have sent out such a letter on the subject. The eighth article, taken in connexion with the correspondence, would seem to admit the right of America to suppress the slave-trade by her own forces; but, if taken in connexion with the noble lord's letter, it would seem to place us in no worse situation than before, unless that from the ambiguity of the positions of the several officers of the two nations some collision might arise between them. It seemed to him that if the conduct pointed out in that letter were firmly persevered in—and he was sure it would receive the support of both houses of Parliament—we should not lose by the eighth article of the treaty. He thought we had a right to prevent the crime of kidnapping, and that it was too much to allow America to say, "My citizens shall traffic in slaves if they think right to do so." He was disposed to take the most favourable and practical view of the treaty. He hoped that America, laying aside the narrow feelings of jealousy with which she had been hitherto actuated, would not allow herself to be made the instrument of the vilest of mankind, whether the buccaneers who were actually engaged in this horrid and abominable trade, or those more odious wretches who sat at home, whether here or in America, and employed their capital in carrying it on, and that France, America, and all other civilized nations of the earth would cordially co-operate with the greatest naval power in the world in putting it down.

Tuesday, April 11th.

SLAVERY AND THE SLAVE-TRADE.

Lord BROUGHAM then rose to lay before the house the bill of which he had given notice, upon the subject of slavery, respecting which some discussion had taken place between his noble friend (Lord Denman) and the noble lord, the President of the Board of Trade, who was not now in his place. The difficulties with which this important question was invested were very great, and were, besides, of a very delicate nature; and before he proceeded to detail to their lordships the particulars of the plan which he was about to propose, he would beg to offer his best thanks to those distinguished individuals by whom he had been assisted in the preparation of this bill. He alluded to that learned and distinguished person, Dr. Lushington, now no longer a member of the House of Commons; to Captain Denman, whose practical knowledge of the subject was well known to their lordships; and to Mr. Beldam, a barrister of very great learning, peculiarly well acquainted with the particulars of this question. He (Lord Brougham) had originally prepared three plans, either of which might have been adopted; but that which he was now about to describe to their lordships was composed of those three, with many important improvements. There were three main objects in view. The first was the prevention of that species of traffic, which (although in moral guilt and pernicious tendencies there was no doubt it was equivalent to the slave-trade) had been doubted by high authority to be within the law of slavery. The question was, whether a person being a British subject, but residing abroad, and not within the bounds of a British settlement, buying and selling slaves, was not just as guilty in so purchasing slaves, and carrying them either to his own plantations to work, or to other plantations for sale, as if he had gone to the coast of Africa, and had thus, upon the high seas, carried on a traffic in slaves? This question, although he thought that the object of the law was clearly defined, had given rise to some doubts and controversy, and it became necessary that a declaratory law should be introduced, to set at rest all further difficulty upon the subject. The next point was to relieve persons holding foreign plantations, from which the slave-trade and the existence of slavery was inseparable. It was proposed, that when a person came to an estate by descent or otherwise, upon which slaves were kept, unless he did some voluntary act to sanction the continuance of that system, he should not be held to be guilty of slavery; and the object of this part of the bill was to relieve persons who so acted involuntarily. The next proposition which it was intended to carry out was to prevent as much as possible the joint-stock companies from dealing with slaves. The shareholders in these specula-

tions being more or less innocent of all participation in crime, most of them only knowing that they bought scrip, and that that was of certain value in the market, and not knowing that they were in the situation of masters of persons engaged in this traffic. It was proposed to be provided that the proper officers of these companies should give security against the carrying on of such traffic by such bonds and securities as, by order in council, Her Majesty in council should provide. Another object of the bill was to strike at the traffic on the coast of Africa. This was provided for in two ways; first, by providing a better mode of trial; and, secondly, by greatly facilitating the means of obtaining evidence in the courts in which questions of slavery were tried. The course proposed to be taken was similar to that already adopted in the East India Judicature Bill, which had been already frequently acted upon, whereby a party proceeding in the English courts was enabled to obtain a mandamus from the Court of Queen's Bench to put the East Indian courts of judicature in motion, for the purpose of examining witnesses, whose evidence so taken was receivable in the courts at home. A third, and the last object of the bill, was to endeavour to prevent parties in this country from continuing to do as they had hitherto done, namely, to restrain them from doing any acts of concurrence in the slave-trade on the coast of Africa, although they should not be actually engaged in carrying on such trade. It was, no doubt, necessary to draw a distinction between the innocent and the guilty; and he thought that this might be done, and the main object gained, by affording to Her Majesty in council the power of making certain orders, and of placing persons engaged in the African slave-trade under some species of obligation or bond, by which they should bind themselves to avoid carrying on any works conducted by slaves. There were other objects proposed to be carried out in the bill, to which he should not now refer, nor should he enter into a discussion of the general question of slavery, or of the precise application of this bill to it. There was a matter referred to the other evening, however, by his noble and learned friend (Lord Denman) on the subject of the foreign slave-trade, upon which he would offer a few words. He must say that he did not profess to be able to understand the ground on which any jurist, or statesman, or common lawyer could hold that, if the law of any given country declared a certain act to be felony, and much more, piracy, and that if a subject of that state chose to commit that act, and was detected in it by a power connected with his country in endeavouring to put down such offences, the country of the person so offending should be able to send an ambassador, to complain of its subject having been stopped in the commission of the offence which both were united to suppress. He should rather say that, where such detection took place, the *comitas gentium* should rather lead to the apprehension of the offender, than to any claim of exemption for him; and that, instead of the country of the person seized claiming such exemption, it would rather rejoice in its subject being exposed to the punishment to which his crime rendered him liable. (Hear.)

Lord CAMPBELL entirely concurred in the satisfactory expression of opinion by his noble and learned friend, (Lord Brougham,) and also by his noble and learned friend (Lord Denman) the other evening. He could not understand why, as between two nations united for the suppression of the slave-trade, by both of whom it had been declared to be felony and piracy, the unlawful traffic should still be allowed to be carried on, more especially when every civilized nation in the world was engaged in the same good cause of putting an end to this dreadful trade. If, by the law of nations, this trade was considered piratical, all engaged in it ought to be considered and treated as pirates. Then slavery would be effectually suppressed, and he feared not till then.

Lord ASHBURTON feared that the view which the noble and learned lords took of the law was rather what all humane and sensible persons would desire the law to be, which all their lordships desired should be the law, and which his noble friend (the Earl of Aberdeen) had pressed all the powers of Europe to make law, than what was law. He feared that his noble and learned friends who had spoken on this subject, learned as they were at Westminster-hall, would not find their view of the law so much acknowledged as they might desire at Doctors' Commons. By insisting that this was contrary to the law of nations, they would hold that we had a right to interfere in cases of suspicion, because it was held by the best authorities that we had a right without treaty to inquire into the right to the flag; but with a treaty only to inquire whether the slave trade or any other crime took place on board ships. What he would much desire, and what would be the happiest day the world ever saw, would be when it should be declared to be law what the noble and learned lords believed to be the law. Such a declaration was what his noble friend near him was pressing on other powers. He was endeavouring to prevail on the powers of the world, one and all, to come to this humane and enlightened view. With respect to the United States, they had not declared the trade to be piracy, but they had pressed this country to deal with it as piracy. Mr. Rush urged us to declare it piracy by the law of nations, which Mr. Canning had declined to do on the clear and intelligible ground that no two nations could make a law of nations; they could declare what was law between England and America, but what was made so by all the Christian powers of Europe and America might well become the law of nations. He assured their lordships that there was no part of America which did not seriously and earnestly desire the suppression of the slave-trade. The Georgias, the Carolinas, and Louisiana were as much interested in the suppression of the slave-trade as was this country, and there had not been for the last fifteen or twenty years any introduction of African slaves into American states.

Lord BROUGHAM had not given countenance to the notion that the English government should act on his views as to the law, he gave them only as speculative opinions. He believed that the law of nations, like the municipal law, was susceptible of improvement by addition; this chapter might be advantageously added, we were very near it, but it was not yet done.

Lord CAMPBELL had not wished it to be supposed that the law as he had laid it down should be acted upon as the law of nations, till it was recognised to be law. He did not think that it need be added, it had become essentially the law of nations, and all that was wanted was a mere declaration of the law.

The Earl of ABERDEEN observed, that when the noble and learned lord said that all the civilized world declared the slave trade to be piracy, he

must remark that there was one country, of some little importance in the world, which declared no such thing—namely, France. Her recognition of that doctrine was still to be obtained. With the most profound respect for the legal opinions of the noble and learned lords opposite as to what was or what ought to be the law, he, as minister, was bound to attend to the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, when he had to deal with foreign powers [hear, hear.] He would take that opportunity of disavowing all intention of casting any imputation on the gallant officer alluded to the other evening (Captain Denman) in the letter he had written [hear, hear]; nothing was further from his intention than to cast any imputation upon that honourable and gallant officer; and even restricted as his own views were as to what was authorised to be done by our cruisers on the coast of Africa, that gallant officer in anything he had done had not come within the exception he had laid down; and he must add, that there was no one who had more distinguished himself in this important service, nor for whom he entertained a higher respect, than that gallant officer (Hear, hear.)

Lord DENMAN thought their lordships would expect some acknowledgment from him of the statement of the noble earl, which was most gratifying to his feelings. He had pointed out the other evening that in the letter of the noble earl he could have had no intention to cast any imputation on the officer in question, and he was now pleased to hear from the noble earl a full confirmation of the construction he had put upon that letter. He must express his great satisfaction at this discussion on the bill of his noble and learned friend, because he was satisfied the more the subject was considered, the more disposition there would be to come to the opinion he had broached the other evening, and which both his noble and learned friends had, to a certain degree, adopted that evening. He was not sure that his own opinions did not go further than theirs, for he had ventured to speak of a natural law of right and wrong, which made a pirate a public enemy, and declared the slave-trade obnoxious to the principles of that law. Nothing, however, was further from his wish than to act directly upon this law, for he deemed it necessary to endeavour to obtain the assistance of other countries to make that law effectual. As far as the practical measures of the government were concerned, he believed that they would do better in their negotiations by starting upon the wider principle, if they viewed the slave-trade in the light of crime which all nations had a right to prevent, than if they simply commenced by petitioning other nations to join them in putting it down. He could bear his testimony to the statement of the noble earl, that there was no slave-trade carried on between the coasts of Africa and America; and he must also bear his testimony to the satisfactory and honourable manner in which the courts of law in America uniformly exerted themselves to put down the slave-trade; the decisions of these courts were models of what ought to be done in reference to the subject: that made the contrast stronger between the government and the judicature; for whilst the one was effectively putting down the slave-trade, the other seemed to encourage their own subjects in carrying on the trade, whilst they nevertheless declared it to be piracy. If the decision of the judicature were to have full force, it appeared strange that the government did not accept the service of our cruisers to bring those persons to trial who had violated their own laws. The excellent decisions of the courts of America would never receive their full and useful effect till this was done; for it was only by the combination of the ships of all the maritime powers we could hope that an impression could be made on so extended a coast as Africa, which extended for 3,600 miles. To suppose that a squadron of 80 guns could bring all the guilty parties to justice was as romantic a notion as any one could entertain. He thought that in all future negotiations a higher tone could be adopted against this enormous crime than could have been taken at a time when the slave-trade prevailed, and many were deeply interested in it; and he thought that the frequent discussion of this question would lead to the useful result of the total suppression of the slave-trade at no distant day.

Lord ASHBURTON and Lord CAMPBELL severally said a few words in explanation;

And the bill was read a first time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Monday, April 10.

WASHINGTON TREATY.

Lord PALMERSTON wished to put a question to the noble lord the Secretary for the Colonies, with respect to some papers laid on the table relative to the negotiations carried on on the subject of the treaty of Washington. In a letter addressed by Lord Ashburton to Mr. Webster, dated August the 7th, 1842, in answer to an application from the latter gentleman on the subject of the *Creole*, the noble lord said, "In the meantime I engage that instructions shall be sent to the governors of Her Majesty's colonies on the southern borders of the United States so to execute these laws as that there shall be no officious interference with American vessels arriving in their ports or driven into them by stress of weather." What he wished to know from the noble lord was, whether any instructions had been sent to those governors in consequence of that engagement of Lord Ashburton's, and if so, what was their nature, and whether the noble lord would object, if any were sent, to lay copies of them on the table?

Lord STANLEY said, that Her Majesty's Government had not thought it necessary to send any instructions to the governors of her colonies on the southern borders of the United States subsequently to or consequent upon the engagement on the part of Lord Ashburton to Mr. Webster. A short time previously to the correspondence referred to, Her Majesty's Government had under their deliberate consideration the case of the *Creole*, out of which the correspondence had arisen, and the whole case, with the questions of law to which it gave rise, had been submitted for the opinions of the law officers of the Crown. Their opinions with respect to several cases had been confidentially communicated to the Government, and by them sent to the governor of the Bahamas, with opinions as to the course which had been pursued, and which should be pursued in future. The governor of the Bahamas had written home for further instructions as to certain hypothetical cases, and respecting these, also, instructions had been sent previously to the communications between Lord Ashburton and Mr. Webster. It was, he trusted, hardly necessary for him to add, that those instructions recognized and maintained to the fullest extent the principle of the right to personal freedom of every per-

son within a British port, on board a vessel of whatever nation and under whatever circumstances; and the noble lord might rest assured that that principle would not be departed from, or that right be weakened, in the hands of Her Majesty's present Government. He (Lord Stanley) had reason to hope that the instructions sent out with respect to the hypothetical cases, and on which the governor of the Bahamas had asked advice, were of a nature substantially to comply with the request made by Mr. Webster on the part of the United States, and assented to by Lord Ashburton. It was therefore not considered necessary to send out any fresh instructions in consequence of the demand of Mr. Webster. As to the opinions of the law officers of the Crown, they had been given confidentially to the Government, and the noble lord (Palmerston) must be well aware that it would be unusual and inconvenient to produce the opinions of the law officers of the Crown under such circumstances. He must add, that it was equally undesirable that the Government should lay before the house instructions made contingent upon hypothetical cases, which might or might not occur.

Lord PALMERSTON said, that in 1839 there had been laid before the house the opinions of the law officers of the Crown as to the rights of slaves entering British ports. He considered the production of the law officers' opinions in the present case as necessary, to show whether the instructions sent out by the present Government differed in any material point from those sent by their predecessors. He wished, in a word, to know whether the views taken by the present Government differed from those of their predecessors, as to the rights of slaves in the vessels of any nation driven by stress of weather, or other cause, into British ports?

Lord STANLEY said, that if he understood the question of the noble Lord, it was, whether the instructions sent out by her Majesty's present Government with respect to the *Creole* differed in any material point from those forwarded by their predecessors? He had not those instructions then before him; but, speaking from memory, he should say, that there had been no deviation by the present Government from the instructions sent by their predecessors in office. The instructions were, that if any man were detained in a ship in a British port, the British governor had only to verify that fact, and then give his immediate protection and assistance to the party so detained.

SLAVERY IN THE EAST.

Mr. S. WORTLEY begged the indulgence of the house, while he called the attention of the Government to a matter which deserved serious attention. He found in a list of papers printed for the house, having reference to the negotiations between Lord Ashburton and the United States, on the eighth article of the treaty of Washington, the copy of a report presented to the Government of the United States by two officers of the American navy, selected by that Government to make the report in question, specially on account of their personal acquaintance with the extent and nature of the slave-trade on the coast of Africa. Having referred to the slave-trade on the west coast of Africa, those gentlemen proceeded to talk of the slave-trade on the east coast, and stated: "From the best information we can obtain, it seems that a large trade is carried on by Portuguese colonies, the Arab chiefs, and negro tribes. Their greatest markets are the Mahomedan countries bordering on the Red Sea and Persian Gulf, the Portuguese East India colonies, Bombay, and perhaps other British possessions in the East Indies. This part of the trade is probably in the hands of the Arabian vessels." This language used in a report laid before the Government of the United States, and communicated to that house, placed this country before the world in such a position as made it desirable that some notice should be taken of it. Whatever those gentlemen might individually assert with respect to the slave-trade on the east coast of Africa might be of little importance to this country; but when he found these allegations contained in a formal report, made by two gentlemen, specially selected on account of their personal knowledge of the subject, and communicated to the American Government, as one of the documents forming the basis of negotiations for arrangements between the two countries, he thought it desirable and important that such allegations should not be allowed to assume more weight than they deserved. For his part (and he believed he spoke the sentiments of every gentleman present), he believed these allegations to be utterly and totally unfounded. (Hear, hear.) They appeared to the members of the British Parliament neither more nor less than ridiculous and absurd; but, knowing the spirit which prevailed among the great mass of the population in the United States, and considering that the British Government was engaged in different parts of the world in carrying on negotiations for the total suppression of the slave trade, and was constantly met by suspicion as to its motives and practice on this subject, he did think it desirable that these somewhat vague allegations should be noticed by the Government.

Sir R. PEEL conceived that the hon. gentleman was, of course, aware of the circumstances under which the document to which he referred had been communicated to the house. The noble lord opposite asked the Government to lay on the table certain papers referred to in the message of the President of the United States, and certain correspondence in relation to the right of visit. He (Sir R. Peel) acceded to that request, and among the papers so furnished was the report by two American naval officers, and he certainly had not considered himself entitled to exclude the passage referred to from that report, which contained the observations made by those two American officers to their own Government. But his hon. friend must not suppose that any sanction was given to statements of the kind in question, because he (Sir R. Peel), in compliance with a motion for information, had laid the documents on the table of the house. At the same time, he was glad to have the opportunity of correcting the erroneous impressions to which the allegations in the report might possibly give rise. With respect to the slave trade being carried on by British subjects in India, or natives of India under British control, there was no ground for believing that any such practice existed. (Hear, hear.) This was a subject which had occupied much of the attention of the late and the present Governments—he alluded to the best mode of effectually suppressing everything partaking of the character of the slave trade and slavery in India. To this subject, it was but fair to say, Lord Auckland had directed much attention, and many communications had taken place with respect to the alleged traffic of slaves on the coast of India. It was impossible to deny that such traffic did occasionally take place, and in the territories of the Nizam to a considerable extent; and that it occasionally

found its way through the British territory into interior districts over which the Indian Government had no control. In November, 1841, an agent of one of the Ameers of Scinde was brought to trial at Bombay for taking four Arab girls from Bombay to Scinde. He was tried, convicted, and sentenced to three or five years' imprisonment. The jury recommended him to mercy, but the Government refused to interfere, and the sentence was in course of execution. Therefore, to say that there was no slave trade in individual cases carried on in India would be to make an assertion not consistent with fact. At the previous sessions at Bombay four other parties had been brought to trial by the intervention of the British authorities for a similar offence, and were convicted and sentenced to five years' imprisonment. The Government had no control over the parties, unless the offence was committed in [the territory of the Indian Government; but the cases he had mentioned afforded a conclusive proof that the Indian Government were applying the British law as far as possible for the correction of this great evil. There was a number of Arabs in some parts of India—persons who were really in the condition of slaves, but who called themselves the wives of those with whom they lived, and it was very difficult, with all the care and caution that could be adopted, to prevent occasional instances of slavery and the slave trade; but the impression that the paragraph referred to by the hon. gentleman was calculated to create that any slave trade was carried on by British subjects in India was without foundation. (Hear, hear.) Every possible means were adopted to check the practice wherever it was found to exist; and, by a singular coincidence, an act would come into force that very day, which would have the effect of materially interfering with the possibility of the slave trade, even by parties over whom the Indian Government had no control. By a recent regulation there had been established, under certain provisions, Vice-Admiralty Courts on the coast of India, and the governors of all the British territories in India, had been invested, by instructions sent out last summer, with the same powers as those possessed by the governors in the West Indies. On this day, as he had before stated, there came into force in India a measure of great importance. This measure, for amending the law regarding the condition of slavery within the territories of the East India Company, was founded on suggestions made by Lord Auckland, and was to take effect on the 6th or 10th of April, 1843. The following was the substance of its enactments:—"1. It is hereby enacted and declared, that no public officer shall, in execution of any decree or order of Court, or for the enforcement of any demand of rent or revenue, sell or cause to be sold any person, or the right to the compulsory labour or services of any person, on the ground that such person is in a state of slavery. 2. And it is hereby declared and enacted that no rights arising out of an alleged property in the person and services of another as a slave shall be enforced by any civil or criminal court or magistrate within the territories of the East India Company. 3. And it is hereby declared and enacted that no person who may have acquired property by his own industry, or by the exercise of any art, calling, or profession, or by inheritance, assignment, gift, or bequest, shall be dispossessed of such property, or prevented from taking possession thereof, on the ground that such person, or that the person from whom the property may have been derived, was a slave. 4. And it is hereby enacted that any act which would be a penal offence if done to a free man, shall be equally an offence if done to any person on the pretext of his being in a condition of slavery." He apprehended that these enactments would provide increased means for putting down the abuse complained of; and he thought he had satisfied the house that the attention of the Government had been for some years directed to this important subject.

Foreign Intelligence.

BRAZILIAN SLAVE-TRADE.—Extract from a letter dated Santos, January 9, 1843:—"We arrived off Santos on November 12, and received information that a slave vessel was daily expected from the east coast. The vessel arrived, but having gained intelligence from the Portuguese on shore that our boats were at the mouth of the river, she landed her cargo a few miles lower down, and thus escaped being captured. The commander of the English cruiser wrote to the Governor of Mozambique, who not being friendly to the slave trade, fined the vessel severely for a breach of the Custom laws, which was reported to the Portuguese Government at home, and an order was despatched for his supersession, it having been found that he was too strict, and that, in consequence, the Colonial Treasury was impoverished, and the officers and soldiers employed in the colony were under the necessity of applying for their pay to the mother country. A duty is paid upon each slave of seven dollars, and the authorities, instead of suppressing the abominable traffic, encourage it by every means in their power. The ship in question sailed from Quillemane with 850 slaves, all children, and landed 620, having lost on the passage about 230. The cost of the slaves at Quillemane is about 32 milreis each, and the price obtained for them when landed was 600 milreis, ready money, leaving a profit, after the deduction of 18 milreis for their subsistence on shore, previous to their being sold, of 550 milreis upon each slave to pay for the expense of their transit, and to reimburse the vile wretches employed in this nefarious traffic, and also to enable them to fee the authorities, in order to hoodwink them. In a conversation I had with the English Consul, Mr. Whittaker, he says that the authorities are all determined to encourage the traffic, alleging that no act can become law by the Portuguese constitution unless it be beneficial to the country generally; and that as the importation of negro slaves is beneficial, and desired by a majority of the people, the treaty entered into by the mother country is not binding upon them. The present Governor acts upon this principle, and the traffic is now in a flourishing state."

POSTSCRIPT.—Up to the period of going to press the Colonial Mail has not arrived. Mauritius papers to the 5th of January last have been received, and the only intelligence of interest which they contain is the notice of the safe arrival of Sir William Gomm, the new Governor.

Printed by WILLIAM TYLER and CHARLES REED, of No. 5, Bolt Court, in the Parish of St. Dunstan, and City of London: and Published by LANCELOT WILDE, of 13, Catherine-street, Strand, in the Parish of St. Mary-le-Strand, and City of Westminster, at 13, Catherine-street, Strand, as aforesaid. Sold by W. EVERETT, 6, Finch-lane, Cornhill. April 19th, 1843.